L. R. Fulmer

SECOND EDITION.

Why I Gave up the Seventh Day

BY

D. M. CANRIGHT

Once a Prominent Leader and Writer of the Seventh Day Adventists, and one of the Founders of their Pacific Coast Paper.

SUBJECTS CONSIDERED

The Jewish Sabbath Abolished
The Commandments of God—What Are They?
The Law of Christ
Thoughts for Careful Study

Published by Messiah's Advocate
712 Seventh Street, Oakland, Cal.
Price 6 cents each- 60 cents per dozen, by mail.

Copyright, 1887 by D. M. Canright. All rights Reserved

PREFACE

I gave up the observance of the seventh day because I became fully convinced that the evidence was not sufficient to justify its observance, and that the blessing of God did not go with the keeping of it. Like thousands of others, when I embraced the seventh-day sabbath I thought that the argument was all on one side, so plain that one hour's reading ought to settle it, so clear that no man could reject the sabbath and be honest. I felt willing to meet the world in its defense. The only marvel to me was that everybody did not see and embrace it.

But after keeping it twenty-eight years; after having persuaded more than a thousand others to keep it; after having read my Bible through, verse by verse, more than twenty times; after having scrutinized, to the very best of my ability, every text, line and word in the whole Bible having the remotest bearing on the sabbath question; after having looked up all these, both in the original and in many translations; after having searched in lexicons, concordances, commentaries and dictionaries; after having read armfuls of books on both sides of the question; after having read every line in all the early church fathers upon this point; after having written several works in favor of the seventh day, which were satisfactory to my brethren; after having debated the question for more than a dozen times; after seeing the fruits of keeping it, and after weighing all the evidence, in the

fear of God and of the judgment, I am fully settled in my own mind and conscience that the evidence is against the keeping of the seventh-day. Now, if others think that they know better about this question than I do, and that they can settle it in a day, as I once did, I shall not quarrel with them, but pity their credulity. I shall give in this tract just a few out of many reasons for renouncing the observance of the seventh-day. I believe that the first day of the week is the Lord's day and should be kept; but must give the reasons for this in another work.

THE JEWISH SABBATH ABOLISHED

Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.

Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:

Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.—Col. 2:14, 16,17.

When I was a firm believer in the seventh-day sabbath, this text always bothered me more or less. The plain, simple reading of it seemed manifestly to teach the abolition of the sabbath. I was impressed with the fact that it had to be EXPLAINED AWAY, and that it took a tremendous amount of fine hair-splitting distinctions to do it. In brief, the way sabbath keepers get over it is this: That which was abolished was "blotted out" and "nailed" to the cross. But, say they, you could not blot out what was engraved on the stone, as the decalogue was, nor could you nail up stone to the

cross. Hence this language must apply to the law written in a book on parchment. Again, that which was abolished was the "handwriting of ordinances," but the decalogue was written with the finger of God, and, they claim, has no ordinances. This again shows that it must refer to the law in the book, and not to the decalogue. It is said to be "against us" and "contrary to us"; but the moral law is not against us. This further indicates that it can not refer to the ten commandments. The law which was done away contained "meats," "drinks," "feast days" and "new moons." None of these are mentioned in the ten commandments, but they are all found in the ceremonial law. There were yearly sabbaths associated with meats, drinks, feastdays, new moons, etc.—just the list Paul gives here. See Lev. 23. So Paul is speaking of those annual sabbaths, and not of the weekly sabbath.

As further proof that this is so, he says that the days done away were "a shadow of things to come," that is of Christ. Col. 2:17. But the seventh-day sabbath was not a shadow of things to come, but was a memorial pointing back to Eden.—Ex. 20:8-11.

This is the line of defense always set up by the seventh-day people on this text. See "The Two Laws," pp. 57-64. But the longer I studied it, the more closely I examined it, the less satisfactory it was, till at length I became fully satisfied that it was unsound, and contrary to the real truth.

The simple facts, I believe, are these: Paul refers to the entire Jewish system, the law of Moses as a whole, of which the decalogue was only a small

part. Every word of the ten commandments, sabbath included, was written by the hand of Moses on parchment, right in with the rest of the law of Moses. See Deut. 5 and other places. As an entire system, as a law taken in all its parts, it was a burdensome system, a yoke of bondage, a schoolmaster designed only to lead us to Christ. Gal. 3:24, 25. It was against us and contrary to us, and as such it was nailed to the cross. The decalogue being written on parchment in the book of the law, it would be proper to speak of it as BLOTTED OUT, nailed to the cross, etc., with the rest of the law. As meats, drinks, feast days, new moons and ordinances were prominent in the law of Moses, they are named as the reasons why that entire law was abolished. Time and again the weekly sabbath is directly associated in the law of Moses with these meats, drinks, feast days, new moons, etc., and hence is properly classed with them by Paul in the New Testament, just as it was in the Old. The sweetest milk, if put into a vinegar barrel, would all be spoiled; a little sour milk in the best cup of coffee would spoil it; a small worm cooked in the best dish of food would render it unfit to eat. The good has to be rejected with the bad when associated together. So the good parts of the law were set aside with the rest because inseparably connected with burdensome rites and ceremonies wholly unfit for the freedom of the gospel. Christ did not remove a PART of the Mosaic system and retain another part. No, the system as a whole had served its object and passed away to give place to an entirely new institution—the gospel. This is the

very point of Christ's parable Luke 5:36-38:

And he spake also a parable unto them: No man putteth a piece of a new garment upon an old; if otherwise, then both the new maketh a rent, and the piece that was taken out of the new agreeth not with the old. And no man putteth new wine into old bottles; else the new wine will burst the bottles, and be spilled, and the bottles shall perish. But new wine must be put into new bottles; and both are preserved.

Would to God our Seventh-day brethren could learn the truth taught in this parable. It exactly illustrates the folly of their work—trying to put new wine (the gospel) into old bottles (the institutions of the old covenant). It spoils both. That the sabbath is repeatedly classed with these, just as Paul classes it in Col. 2:16, will be seen by the following scriptures: In Lev. 23, Moses gives a list of the Jewish holy days, and places the sabbath first in the list, followed in their order by the passover and all the rest. Thus, "Concerning the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even these are my feasts.—"verse 2. "Six days shall work be done; but the seventh day is the sabbath of rest."—verse 3. "In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's passover."—verse 5. "And on the fifteenth day of the same month, is the feast of unleavened bread.—"verse 6. "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall ye have a sabbath."—verse 24. "Also on the tenth day of this seventh month there shall be a day of atonement."—verse 27. "Also in the fifteenth day of the seventh month."—verse 39. "These are the feasts of the Lord."—verse 37. "And

Moses declared unto the children of Israel the feast of the Lord.—"verse 44. Here we have the sabbath directly associated with meats, drinks, and all the Jewish feasts, just as Paul puts it in Col. 2:16. It is, however, claimed by Seventh-day Adventists that the Lord separates out the sabbath from all these, showing that it is of a different nature, in these words (verses 37-38), "These are the feasts of the Lord: . . . . besides the sabbaths of the Lord." Yes, but read the whole verse, "Besides the sabbaths of the Lord, and besides your GIFTS, and besides all your VOWS, and besides all your FREE-WILL OFFERINGS, which ye give unto the Lord." Not only the sabbaths, but GIFTS, VOWS, and OFFERINGS are also classed with the sabbath in the same verse. The idea is this: the sabbath, the gifts, vows, and offerings are of regular weekly or daily occurrence, whereas the other holy days and special offerings were to come only once a year at stated seasons. They were not to take the place of the regular daily and weekly services, but must be observed BESIDES all these. Any one can see that this is the simple meaning of the words "besides the sabbaths of the Lord, and besides your gifts," etc. The idea is not to distinguish the sabbath above the other feasts, but to say that these must be kept in addition to the regular service of the sabbath and daily offerings.

So Num. 28:9-31, "And on the sabbath day two lambs." "And in the beginning of your months [new moons] ye shall offer a burnt offering." "And in the fourteenth day of the first month is the passover." "His meat offering . . . . and their drink

offerings." So also I Chron. 23:31, "To offer all burnt sacrifices unto the Lord in the sabbaths, in the new moons, and on the set feasts." In no less than twelve different places is the sabbath classed right in with these new moons and feast days. Yet, I, like all my seventh-day brethren, firmly believed and have said a thousand times, that the seventh-day sabbath was never associated with new moons and feast days. It is now unaccountable to me how I ever could have been so blind.

But it is argued that as "the sabbath days" of Col. 2:16 "are a shadow of things to come" (verse 17), and the weekly sabbath is a memorial of creation, pointing back to the beginning, therefore they can not be the same, for the sabbath could not point both ways. But is not this a mere assertion without any proof? How do we know that it can not point both ways? The passover was a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, and always pointed back to that event. Ex. 12:11-17. Yet it was also a shadow of Christ. Col. 2:16-17. Even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us."—1 Cor. 5:7. So all those annual feasts were types of Christ in some way, and yet all were memorials also of past events, as all know. Elder J. N. Andrews, in his "History of the Sabbath," chap. 7, admits this. But who would ever have thought of this if the Apostle had not said so?

If, then, these feast days could be both memorials and types, pointing both ways, so can the sabbath. Paul says plainly that the sabbath days are a shadow of things to come; and one plain statement of inspiration is worth a thousand of our vain reason-

ings. This is in harmony with Paul's argument in Heb. 4:1-11, that the seventh-day is a type. For forty years we have tried to explain away this text, and to show that it really can not mean what it says; but there it stands and mocks all our theories. The sabbath is a type, for inspiration says so.

Again, it is said that the sabbath was instituted before the fall, but types could not have been instituted till after the fall. How do you know that they could not be? Where does the Bible say so? Peter says of Christ: "Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you."—1 Peter 1:20. The revelator says, "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."—Rev. 13:8. If, then, Christ before the foundation of the world was ordained to die, then the sabbath might have been designed even before the creation of the earth, as a type of Christ. So, on close inspection, every argument of our seventh-day brethren on Col. 2, fails them.

But that upon which they rely the most of all to save this text from applying to the sabbath is the confident assertion that there were several yearly or annual sabbath days, and that Paul's language must apply to these instead of to the weekly sabbaths. Thus, Elder J. N. Andrews, in his "History of the Sabbath," says, "There were SEVEN annual sabbaths," and then he names all the Jewish feast days, as the pentecost, day of atonement, etc., and cites Lev. 23. It is true that in our English version the word SABBATH is applied to FOUR of these feast days. Thus, "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall ye have a sabbath."—

Lev. 23:24. "Also on the tenth day . . . . shall be unto you a sabbath."—verses 27-32. Also of the feast on the fifteenth to the twenty-second of the month, "the first day shall be a sabbath, and on the eighth day shall be a sabbath."—verse 39. Here it is claimed are at least four annual sabbaths, and to these are referred "the sabbath days" of Col. 2.

But we turn to the Greek, in which Paul wrote, and find that the word for "sabbath days" is SABBATON, exactly the word and the only word that is ever used for the seventh-day sabbath. Is that the term used where the word SABBATH is applied to the annual feast days? No, indeed, except in just barely ONE instance. The day of atonement, the tenth day of the seventh month, is called a sabbath (SABBATON) in the Greek. Lev. 23:32. The Hebrew word for sabbath is shabbath. In only this one instance is it ever applied to any of the annual festivals. The word "sabbath" in the English version, when applied to these annual feasts, is from the Greek term ANAPAUSIS, and in the Hebrew from SHABBATHON. These words should not be translated "sabbath," but should be rendered "rest," as they are in the Revised Version. Thus all these texts read in the New Version, "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, there shall be a solemn REST unto you."—Lev. 23:24. "On the first day shall be a solemn REST and on the eighth day shall be a solemn REST."—verse 39. So also in the English version of the Hebrew used by the Jews these words are translated REST, not sabbath. Thus: "In the seventh month, on the first day of the

month, shall ye have a REST," not sabbath.—verse 24. "On the first day shall be a REST, and on the eighth day shall be a REST."—verse 39.

Lam. 1:7 is claimed as one of these Jewish annual sabbaths. See "History of the Sabbath," p. 90. But properly translated, it has no reference to any sabbath. In the original the word rendered "sabbaths" is, Hebrew, mishbattim; Greek, katoihesia, which is not the usual word for sabbath, nor is it translated so anywhere else in the whole Bible. The Revised Version renders it, "They did mock at her desolations." The Jews' Bible renders it, "They laughed at the cessation [of her glory]" So this text has no reference to any sabbath.

Hence, except the weekly sabbaths, among all the feast days and holy days of the Old Testament only one single day in the whole year is ever called a sabbath. So it is not correct to speak of "the annual sabbaths," much less to say that there were seven of them. There was just one, and no more, and this one was included in the annual feast days. This even Elder Andrews confesses. He says "The annual sabbaths were part and parcel of these feasts."—"History of the Sabbath," p. 86. So, then, that one annual sabbath was embraced in the term, feast days. Therefore, "the sabbath days of Col. 2:16 cannot possibly be applied to the annual holy days, for sabbaton, the word there used, is not the word used for these days. Feast days (heortes) is the term embracing all those days, as we have seen. Hence "the sabbath days" (sabbaton) must apply only to the weekly sabbaths. Or, to say the least, this term being pre-eminently, almost exclus-

ively, applied to the weekly sabbaths, must include them any way, whether it did any others or not.

And if Paul had meant to name the weekly sabbath days he could have used no other term for them than the one he did use, sabbaton. Let Sabbatarians weigh this well. Now read together a few of many texts where we certainly know that the weekly sabbaths are meant. It will be noticed that the plural number is used, the same as in Col 2:16. "Verily my sabbaths [plural] ye shall keep: for it [singular] is a sign.—Ex. 31:13. We know this is the weekly sabbath. "Keep my sabbaths."—Lev. 19:3. "Ye shall keep my sabbaths."—Lev. 19:30. "Besides the sabbaths of the Lord."—Lev. 23:38. All claim this to be the weekly sabbath. "Keep my sabbaths."—Isa. 56:4. "I gave them my sabbaths to be a sign." "My sabbaths they greatly polluted."—Ezek. 20:12,13. "On the sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the sabbath." "Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath days?"—Matt. 12:5,10. Jesus "taught them on the sabbath days."—Luke 4:31. "Is it lawful on the sabbath days?"—Luke 6:9. "Three sabbath days reasoned."—Acts 17:2. "Let no man therefore judge you . . . . in respect . . . of the sabbath days".—Col. 2:16.

Who can read this list of texts and not be profoundly impressed that by "the sabbath days" of Col. 2:16, Paul means just what that language means in all the other cases? Of course he did, and no other reasonable application can be made of it. Add to this the fact that in the Greek the same term is used in all these cases, and the conclusion is inevitable. Not only the same word, but precisely

the same form of the word that is used in Col. 2:16, is time and again used for the weekly sabbath. Thus, Matt. 28:1, "In the end of the sabbath"; Luke 4:16, "on the sabbath days"; Acts 13:14, "on the sabbath day"; Col. 2:16, "the sabbath days." Exactly the same original word, letter for letter, in all these texts, as every one who can read a word of Greek knows. All the others mean the weekly sabbaths. Then why not this also?

Once more. The word sabbath occurs sixty times in the New Testament. In fifty-nine of these sixty times it is freely admitted by all seventh-day people that it means the weekly sabbath; but in the sixtieth case where exactly the same word is used, both in Greek and English, they stoutly contend that it must mean something else! See Scripture References, p. 9. Does not this look a little suspicious? But, as we have seen, there are no other sabbath days to which it could apply.

Further, Paul simply and squarely said, "the sabbath days" without making any exception, hence the weekly sabbaths must have been included at least. It is certain that no Sabbatarian would ever have written as Paul did here. I have often wished that this text was not in the Bible, and it troubles my Seventh-day Adventist brethren as much as it did me, say what they will.

But what settles it beyond a reasonable doubt that Col. 2:16 does refer to the weekly sabbaths is the fact that exactly the same list of holy days here given by Paul is given about a dozen times in the Old Testament, where we know it means the seventh day. Remember, that among all the feast days

and holy days of the law of Moses, only one day, besides the weekly sabbaths, is ever called a sabbath, and that never occurs in the plural number, for it was only ONE day in the whole yearly round of service. Besides, this annual sabbath was a part of the annual festivals, and was included in the term "feast days."

Let us look at the law concerning these holy days. Lev. 24:5-9 orders how the priests shall set the shewbread before the Lord "every sabbath." Now turn to Num. 28 and 29, and you have a detailed law as to just what offerings shall be made on each day of the whole year. The first were the DAILY, or "continual," offerings of "two lambs, day by day, for a continual burnt offering." "The one lamb shalt thou offer in the morning, and the other lamb shalt thou offer at the even".—verses 3 and 4. The second were the offerings on the sabbath. "And on the sabbath day two lambs of the first year without spot."—verses 9 and 10. None will deny that this was the weekly sabbath. Third, in the very next verse come the new moons. "And in the beginnings of your months ye shall offer a burnt offering unto the Lord."—verses 11-15. Fourth, comes the annual feast days. "And in the fourteenth day of the first month is the passover of the Lord."—verse 16. Then follows a complete list of all the annual feast days, including the day of atonement, and closing with these words, "These things shall ye do unto the Lord in your set feasts". —Num. 29:39.

Here we have the law for the DAILY, WEEKLY, MONTHLY, and YEARLY offerings; or, those

on each day, on the weekly sabbaths, on the new moons, and on the set or appointed yearly feast days. Remember the phrase "set feasts," as it will occur in the other texts referring to this law in Numbers. Now read the following texts, and notice how this list of daily or continual offerings, offerings on the sabbaths, on the new moons, and on the set feasts, as were laid down in the law of Moses, is repeatedly referred to in almost exactly the words of Col. 2:16.

1 Chron. 23:30-31, "And to stand every morning to thank and praise the Lord, and likewise at even; and to offer all burnt sacrifices unto the Lord in the sabbaths, in the new moons, and on the set feasts by number, according to the order commanded unto them." Here is a direct reference to the daily offerings, offerings on the weekly sabbaths, new moons, and set feasts, just as ordered in Num. 28 and 29. Can any one doubt that "the sabbaths" here are the weekly sabbaths, the same as there? Certainly not.

2 Chron. 2:4, "Behold, I build an house to the name of the Lord my God to dedicate it to him, and to burn before him sweet incense, and for the continual shew bread, and for the burnt offerings morning and evening [daily], on the sabbaths [weekly,] and on the new moons [monthly], and on the solemn feasts [yearly] of the Lord." Precisely the same list again, and in the same order; hence the weekly sabbaths are the ones named. Besides, it would be absurd to suppose that Solomon would name all the other and minor holy days but say nothing about the chiefest of all days, the week-

ly sabbaths. Every candid man will admit that "the sabbaths" here are the weekly sabbaths; and so they are in all the passages which follow.

2 Chron. 8:13, Even after a certain rate every day [daily again,] offering according to the commandment of Moses, on the sabbaths [weekly], and on the new moons [monthly], and on the solemn feasts [yearly], three times in the year." Same list and order as before.

2 Chron. 31:3, "The morning and evening burnt offerings, and the burnt offerings for the sabbaths, and for the new moons, and for the set feasts, as it is written in the law of the Lord." The same list again, daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly offerings, just in the order they would naturally come, and just as given "in the law of the Lord".—Num. 28 and 29. But if these sabbaths are not the weekly sabbaths, then the Lord names the daily, monthly and yearly offerings, but skips the weekly offerings. Every thinking man knows that such an interpretation is false. But it is the only way the sabbath can be saved from Paul's list, Col. 2:16; for that is the same as all these.

Neh. 10:33, "For the shew bread, and for the continual meat offering, and for the continual burnt offering, of the sabbaths, of the new moons, for the set feasts." Same list again, daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly. Either the weekly sabbaths are meant here, or else reference to the worship of God on the sabbath is always studiously avoided, while all the rest is carefully mentioned. The evidence is too plain to mistake which it is.

Isaiah 1:13, 14, "Incense is an abomination unto

me: the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I can not away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth." Though all these days had been appointed by God himself, yet none of this service was acceptable while they committed iniquity.

Ezek. 45:17, "Offerings in the feasts, and in the new moons, and in the sabbaths." Here are named exactly the same days that Paul gives in Col. 2:16, and in the same order, yearly, monthly, weekly.

Ezek. 46:1, 3, 11, "The gate of the inner court that looketh toward the east shall be shut the six working days; but on the sabbath it shall be open, and in the day of the new moon it shall be opened." The weekly sabbath, sure. The next verse directs how the prince shall come in through that gate when thus opened on the sabbath. Then it tells how the people shall do at the same time. "Likewise the people of the land shall worship at the door of this gate before the Lord in the sabbaths and in the new moons." —verse 3. Here "the sabbath" of verse 1 is sabbaths in verse 3, and in both places it is connected with new moons. After directing what shall be done on both these days, next the feast days are taken up, verse 11, "And in the feasts," etc. The sabbaths, new moons, and feasts again, as frequently mentioned before. Here we know that "the sabbaths" are the weekly sabbaths.

Hosea 2:11, "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts." Same list of holy days that we have had over and over, where we

know that sabbaths mean the seventh days.

Col. 2:16, "Let no man therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day (Rev. Version), or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days." Here, as before, are the yearly, monthly, and weekly holy days just as laid down in the law, Num. 28 and 29, where we know the weekly sabbaths are meant. It is evident that Paul had in his mind those lists of holy days so often given in the Old Testament, where the sabbath is included.

But in Hosea 2:11 an effort is made by sabbath keepers to distinguish these sabbaths from the weekly sabbaths because they are called "her sabbaths." But the assertion is unsupported by any proof. So we have seen that there was only one sabbath day in the whole year, besides the weekly sabbaths. Why were the yearly holy days HER days? Did the Jews appoint them? No; the Lord appointed them just as he did the sabbath, and gave them to Israel to keep just as he gave them the sabbath to keep. Hence, from one point of view they are the Lord's, but from another view they are her days. God's, because he commanded them; hers, because given to them. "I gave them my sabbaths".—Ezra 20:12. So we read of nearly every sacred institution of the Bible. In one place it is "the Lord's" and in the next it is "hers," "yours" or "theirs," but the same institution all the time. Thus we read of the temple: "Mine house" —Isaiah 56:7; "your house"—Matt. 23:38. Of the sacrifices: "The sacrifices of the Lord made by fire" —Lev. 10:13; "my offering, and my bread for my sacrifices"—Num. 28:2; "your burnt offerings, and

your sacrifices, and your tithes"—Deut. 12:6. Of the law: "My law"—Jer. 6:19; "your law"—John 10:34. Now notice particularly that the feast days are spoken of in exactly the same manner that the sabbath is; that is, "my feasts" and "her feasts," "my sabbaths" and "her sabbaths." Thus: "The feasts of the Lord"—Lev. 23:4; "the sabbaths of the Lord"—verse 38; "my feasts".—verse 2; "my sabbaths"—Ex. 31:13; "a feast unto the Lord"—Lev. 23:41; "the holy sabbath unto the Lord".—Ex. 16:23; "HER feast days, HER new moons, and HER sabbaths."—Hosea 2:11. These quotations are sufficient to show the fallacy of trying to make a distinction between "my sabbaths" and "her sabbaths." The same argument would prove that "my feasts" and "her feasts," "my sacrifices" and "your sacrifices," "my house" and "your house," etc., were entirely different. But everybody knows better. These expressions apply to the same thing from different standpoints: the sabbaths of the Lord as appointed by him; her sabbaths as kept by them; and this is the whole of it.

In the above from Hosea 2:11 is a plain prophecy that all these holy days should cease, just as we know has happened in fact; and in Col. 2:16 is proof that they were nailed to the cross.

To sum up: that "the sabbaths" in all the above texts are the weekly sabbaths is manifest from many facts:

1. Because no other days were ever called "the sabbath." Just one other solitary day in the whole year was called "a sabbath," and even that is included in the feast days.

2. Because "the sabbaths" or "the sabbath days" is exactly the way the weekly sabbaths are designated, time and again.

3. Because in each case in the law of Moses where the directions for the services on all holy days are carefully laid down, the weekly sabbaths are first named, followed by all the other sacred days, just as they are in these many texts—sabbaths, new moons, and feast days. In several of these cases we are referred right back to what Moses commanded. This fixes the sabbath to the seventh day, and leaves no chance for doubt.

4. Because, as the object in these passages is to mention the service of God which must be performed on each of the holy days, it would be absurd to suppose that all the other sacred days in the whole year would be carefully mentioned time and again, while no reference whatever is made to the weekly sabbaths, the most important and the most numerous of all the sacred days.

5. Because the term "the sabbaths" would certainly embrace the weekly sabbaths unless they were specially named as excepted. But no such exception is made. Hence we must apply the term as it is used in the law, to the seventh day.

6. The Greek word sabbaton used by Paul is the very word everywhere used for the weekly sabbath days.

7. If Paul had designed to name the weekly sabbaths, he could have used no other term than the one he did use, sabbaton.

The only possible answer to be made to all the above is that the weekly sabbaths are not a shadow

of the gospel. But this we have already answered. It is a mere assertion against Paul's direct statement that they are.

But it is said that this view of Paul's language abolishes all holy days and leaves the Church without any rest day. The answer is easy and manifest. Paul was treating of the old institutions which had been nailed to the cross. Col. 2:14. Hence his language has no reference to the new institutions of the gospel, of which there might have been a dozen holy days so far as these texts are concerned.

After the most careful investigation on both sides, I solemnly believe in the fear of God that the above position on Col. 2:16 is correct. I have not one doubt about it.

Finally, the Seventh-day Adventists make a business of doing just what Paul here forbids, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink," etc. About the first thing they do when they enter a family or a neighbor's house is to begin to judge them about what they eat and what they drink and what days they keep, the very things Paul says we should not do. I have done this for twenty years, and know what I say. All their workers do the same thing, as everybody knows. Why? Because unconsciously to themselves they are studying and preaching the law more than the gospel.

THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD

There is no other one thing about which Seventh Day Adventists talk and preach and write so much as about "the commandments." "Here are they

that keep the commandments of God"—Rev. 14:12. This is their golden text, their motto, their battle cry, their church covenant, and that around which all their work is made to center. No one except those who keep the seventh day keeps "the commandments." They are "the commandment keepers"; all others are "the commandment breakers, trampling on the law of God." They claim that the commandments here (Rev. 14:12) are the ten commandments, nothing more and nothing less. One of these, the sabbath, has been changed by the Pope to Sunday. Hence, keeping Sunday is the mark of the beast. Rev. 14:9-12. To "keep the commandments," with them means to keep the decalogue, specially the seventh-day sabbath, This doctrine I preached with great zeal for many years. Now I am fully convinced that there is no foundation for it in the Bible. In a large majority of cases all through the Bible, Old Testament and New, "the commandments" is a term applied to something besides the ten commandments, or at least it includes more than them. So this is a vital point with sabbath keepers. We shall examine it.

It applies to the sacrifices. Lev. 22 relates wholly to the priesthood and to the sacrifices. Referring to these we read: "And when ye will offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving unto the Lord, offer it at your own will . . . Therefore shall ye keep my commandments, and do them."—verses 29-31. "My commandments" here refers to the directions concerning the sacrifices, as all can see.

It applies to the commandments which Moses gave. "A blessing, if ye obey the commandments

of the Lord your God, which I command you this day: and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God, and turn aside out of the way which I command you this day."—Deut. 11:27,28. Here "the commandments of the Lord" are those which Moses gave that day. Again, "Thou shalt hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, to keep all his commandments which I command thee this day."—Deut. 13:18. This refers, not to the decalogue, but to what Moses taught them.

It refers to the tithing. "When thou hast made an end of tithing, ... then thou shalt say, . . . I have not transgressed thy commandments, neither have I forgotten them."—Deut. 26:12,13. This is not the decalogue.

It refers to the whole law of Moses. "It shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth".—Deut. 28:1. Would God bless them so if they simply kept the ceremonial law given by Moses, but broke the moral law? The evident truth is that "the commandments of God," which Moses says he gave, must include the ten commandments and all other precepts given to the Jews through Moses, whether this related to moral, civil, or ceremonial precepts.

Young's Analytical Concordance gives a list of over eight hundred texts where "the commandments" in various forms is used. Any one, by simply running these through, can readily see that

"the commandments of God" is a term which is applied to all the instruction which God has ever given his people, either through the patriarchs, by his own voice, by Moses, by the prophets, by the Savior, or by the apostles. It is a general, comprehensive term for all the requirements of the Bible. To limit the commandments to merely the decalogue is to do violence to the plainest meaning of the term in a great majority of cases.

Take one text so often quoted by Seventh-day people, and always applied to just the decalogue alone. "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man."—Eccl. 12:13. On this text the Signs of the Times, Oakland, Cal., Jan. 30, 1887, says: "From these verses, then, we learn: (1) That the ten commandments contain the whole duty of man; there is no duty outside of them; (2) that the ten commandments are the standard by which men shall be judged; for they are to be judged according to what they have done; and the ten commandments is what they are required to do; (3) that the judgment will take into account every work, and every secret thing; and (4) that therefore the ten commandments cover every secret thing, that is, every thought."

See how positive they always are that the commandments are just the ten commandments. Can they prove it? No; for it is a pure assumption. Look at the facts:

Solomon, a Jewish king, wrote this to the Jewish people. Did the decalogue teach the whole duty of a Jew? Was it not the duty of every man in Israel to pay tithes, offer sacrifices, be circumcised, to

keep the yearly feasts, and to do so many other things in no way mentioned, nor even implied, in the ten commandments? All must admit that this is so. Then the ten commandments did not contain all the duty of man, and hence this text must have a wider application than merely the decalogue. It must embrace all the precepts given to the Jews. Take another illustration of God's commandments, one which Seventh-day Adventists are constantly using and applying it only to the ten commandments.

Matt. 15:4, "For God commanded, saying, Honor thy father and mother: and, he that curseth father or mother, let him die the death." Here are two quotations from the Old Testament, and Jesus says "God commanded" both, one as much as the other; but while one is from the decalogue (Ex. 20:12), the other is from the law of Moses (Lev. 20:9). Here is another text showing plainly what "the commandments" means. Notice that the question is about the law, and what is the greatest commandment in that law. The Son of God is here himself to answer that important question. Surely he will name the greatest commandment of the highest law. Put this question to a Sabbatarian and he would surely point out the sabbath of the decalogue as the greatest of all. But now hear the Savior (Matt. 22:35-40), "Then one of them, which was a lawyer, asked him a question, tempting him, and saying, Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first

and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

Is not this astonishing? Jesus does not quote from the decalogue at all, but both his quotations are from the law of Moses (see Deut. 6:5; Lev. 19:18). So then the supreme law, on which all other laws hang, is not in the decalogue, but in the law of Moses. So also the two great commandments, than which there is none greater (Mark 12:28-33), are in the law of Moses, instead of in the decalogue. Pre-eminently, then, by the authority of Christ himself, in the New Testament, these two are "the commandments of God" Will any one deny this? No. Then when I read in another part of the New Testament, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God" (Rev. 14:12), should we not conclude that these are the commandments meant, instead of the decalogue? Most assuredly. Be it understood, then, that the commandments of God are something more than the decalogue.

Notice the fact that Jesus quoted indifferently both from the decalogue and from the law of Moses, and calls it all the law and the commandments of God, but puts those from Moses as the greatest. Hence it is pure assumption to apply the term "the commandments" to the decalogue only.

The commandments of Jesus and his apostles are the commandments of God.

As we have shown above, the precepts of Moses and the prophets are called "the law" and "the commandments of God." How reasonable, then,

that the precepts of Jesus and his apostles should also be called "the commandments of God." We shall now show that this is just the truth. It was foretold that when Christ should come the Lord would put his words into the Savior's mouth, and he would speak God's commands. Deut. 18:18,19. So when Jesus came he said (John 12:48-50), "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day. For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak."

Christ's words, then, will judge the world; hence they must be the rule by which they should live. If the Father gave Christ a commandment, and he spoke it, is not that God's commandment? Certainly. On the mount of transfiguration God said, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him."—Matt. 17:5. Before this they were to hear Moses and the prophets, but now a greater than these is here, even the Son of God himself, "Hear ye him." The Father had given all things into his hands (John 3:35), hence "he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes."—Matt. 7:29.

Notice how Jesus places his teachings above all those who had taught before him, even above the ten commandments. "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill: but I say unto you," etc.—Matt. 5:21,22. Here Jesus manifestly places his teachings above that of the

decalogue. "It was said . . . but I say." "It hath been said, . . . but I say." Verses 27, 28, 31, 32, etc. In the plainest possible manner Jesus here places the authority of his sayings above that of the ten commandments and all the Old Testament. The old dispensation was passing away, and the Lord was proclaiming the commandments of God for the new dispensation, the gospel. So in the great commission he said, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" —Matt. 28:20. The commandments of Christ are what they are now to teach, not the commandments of the old law.

Again Jesus said (John 14:15,21), "If ye love me, keep my commandments." "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him."

How can we, in the face of these plain texts, say that Jesus gave no commandments? Who is it that loves Christ? He that keeps his commandments. This is what it is in the New Testament to be a "commandment keeper." So again (John 15:10,14), "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love." "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you."

If, then, we do what Jesus commands us, is not that enough? and shall we not be safe and sure of his love and the love of his Father? But where did Jesus ever command to keep the seventh day? Nowhere.

So Luke says he was taken up, "after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen."—Acts 1:2. If Jesus gave commandments through the Holy Ghost, would they not be the commandments of God? Are not these equal to those given through Moses? Now hear Paul as to what are the commandments in the gospel: "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord."—1 Cor. 14:37.

Then all Paul's writings are "the commandments of God." And the Apostle says, Let those who are spiritual acknowledge it. Will our Seventh-day brethren acknowledge it? They may see a new meaning in "the commandments of God" (Rev. 14:12) if they will. Again Paul says, "For ye know what commandments we gave you by the Lord Jesus."—1 Thess. 4:2. Then the apostles did give commandments by the authority of the Lord Jesus. Peter bears a similar testimony (2 Pet. 3:2), "That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandments of us the apostles of the Lord and Savior."

In all the Seventh-day literature you never see anything called "the commandments" except the decalogue. I am certain that the great body of that people never dream that the word "commandments" ever means anything but the ten commandments. They always use it in that sense, so that wherever they find the word commandments they always apply it to the ten commandments, and to

nothing else. But after most carefully examining every passage in the Bible where the word commandments occurs, I am satisfied that at least in forty-nine cases out of fifty it means something else. This is where sabbath keepers have suffered themselves to be misled. Entole, the Greek word for commandment, occurs in the New Testament, in its singular and plural forms, sixty-eight times. In at least forty-eight of these cases it can not mean the decalogue, and in over half of the others it is used in a general way. In not a single case is it certain that it means all the ten and nothing more. There is not a hint that it means the decalogue in any one of the three passages where it occurs in Revelation. To claim that it does is to assume without evidence the very point to be proved. John, who wrote the book of Revelation, also wrote the Gospel of John and the three epistles of John. He uses the word "commandments," plural and singular, twenty-eight times, and in not a single case does it refer to the ten commandments; but in nearly every case, if not in all, it refers to the commandments of Jesus. See John 14:15, 21; 15:10; 1 John 2:1-5; 3:22-24; 4:21; 5:1-3.

It is evident that the same terms, by the same writer, in Revelation, means the commandments of Christ, the same as in the other cases.

"And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world. And hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him,

and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him."—1 John 2:1-4. "His commandments" in this text means the precepts of Christ, as the context shows; yet sabbath keepers always apply it to the decalogue. Here is another text which is misapplied in the same way (1 John 3:22), "And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight." "His commandments"—decalogue of course. But now read the very next verse, which tells what these commandments are (verse 23), "And this is his commandment, That we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment". Here it is to believe on Christ, or to obey what he has commanded. So it is probable that John means the same thing in Revelation. Who will deny that the commandments of Christ are the commandments of God?

For myself, I have become fully satisfied that "the commandments of God" (Rev. 14:12) has no reference to the ten commandments. Of course it can easily be assumed and asserted that this is the decalogue, but certainly it cannot be proved. It is much more probable that it refers to the precepts of Christ and his apostles. Instead of applying it to the decalogue, it would be much more reasonable to apply it to the two great commandments named by Jesus in Matt. 22:36-40. If "the commandments of God" (Rev. 14:12) does not mean the decalogue, specially the sabbath, then the whole theory of the "three messages," the mark of the beast, the seal of God and the sabbath reform, goes to pieces.

I am profoundly convinced that the evidence is against such an application. To say the least, the evidence is wholly insufficient to support such accumulative and complicated theory as is built upon this text. No living man has preached the "Third Angel's Message" more extensively or more earnestly than I have. My brethren used to think I made it very clear. To-day I am satisfied beyond a doubt that the theory is false, that the evidence is against it, and that my dear brethren who are building their hopes upon it are destined to a sad disappointment.

THE LAW OF CHRIST

The theory that makes the decalogue everything leaves no room for "the law of Christ." Indeed, with that idea of the law, there can be no place for it, because the decalogue is "the law," "the law of God," "the law of the Lord," "the commandments," the rule of life, the standard of judgment, covering every duty of man to God and to his fellow man. Not a single sin can any man commit in thought, word, or deed which is not covered by the decalogue. Then what place could there be for the law of Christ? None whatever. And those who hold this view of the matter deny that Jesus really has any law. They say, if he has a law, and we break it, who is our mediator?

And yet the New Testament is very plain on this point that Jesus has a law, notwithstanding all this reasoning to the contrary. If all the law and all the commandments governing Christians existed before Jesus began his ministry, why should he, or

how could he, give commandments and a law? But let us see. If Moses gave a law (John 1:17) and commandments (Deut. 28:1), though only a servant (Heb. 3:5), how much more probable that Jesus Christ, who is Lord of all and a son over his own house, the Church (Heb. 3:6), should give a law and commandments to his own Church? That he did so is as plainly stated as words can state anything. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ."—Gal. 6:2. Then Christ certainly has a law. Of him Isaiah says (42:4), "The isles shall wait for his law." "For out of Zion [not Sinai] shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."—2:3. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."—Rom. 8:2. "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them."—John 14:21. "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them."—Matt. 7:24. "Ye sin against Christ."—1 Cor. 8:12. These and similar texts prove beyond all controversy that Jesus Christ has a law and commandments which Christians should obey. Hence Paul says that he was "under the law to Christ."—1 Cor. 9:21. Then are Christians under two laws, the old law of Sinai and the new law of Christ, at the same time? Of course not.

As Christ is our "Lord and Master" (John 13:13), the "Head" of the Church (Eph. 1:22), "all and in all" (Col. 3:11), having "all power in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18), and is to judge the world (John 5:22) at his judgment seat (Rom. 14:10), how reasonable that he should give the laws to that

Church. This is just what he did do (Matt. 28:18-20; Acts 1:1,2). If any one will obey the teachings of Christ he need not fear about his salvation.

The Seventh-day Adventists preach the law and write and talk about the law and sabbath ten times as much as they do about Christ. This is not overstated, as an examination of their writings will prove. With them the law is first and Christ second. This is a bad feature of that system, for it does lead many to trust more in their works than in Christ, as I certainly know.

SOME THOUGHTS FOR CAREFUL STUDY

"THE LAW."

This term generally refers to the whole system of law given to the Jews under the Mosaic economy. John 1:17. Thus Elder G. I. Butler, a former leader of the Seventh-day Adventists, says: "The term 'the law' among the Jews generally included the five books of Moses, thus including the whole system, moral, ritual, typical, and civil."—"The Law in the Book of Galatians," p. 70. A good confession. Here is proof that all those five books are called "the law": 1 Cor. 14:34 refers to Gen. 5:16; Rom. 7:7, to Ex. 20:17; Matt. 22:36-40, to Deut. 6:5 and Lev. 19:18; Matt. 12:5, to Num. 28:9. There is not one case in a hundred where "the law" means only the decalogue.

"THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS."

With the Jews this was a familiar expression for the whole Old Testament. The "law" or "the book of the law" (Gal. 3:10) was the five books of Moses. See Butler, above. The "prophets," or

"the book of the prophets" (Acts 7:42), was the rest of the Old Testament except the poetical books. These are sometimes mentioned under a third division, "the Psalms." See Luke 24:44; Matt. 5:17; 7:12; 11:13; 22:40; Luke 16:16, 29, 31; John 1:45; Acts 13:15; 24:14; 26:22; 28:23; Rom. 3:21. It is utterly absurd and contrary to all the evidence to limit "the law" (Matt. 5:17) to the decalogue. It means there just what it always does in the expression "the law and the prophets," that is, the five books of Moses. "Till heaven and earth pass" is rendered by Luke (chap. 16:17), "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the law to fail." The idea is not the length of time the law was to last, but the certainty that it would all be fulfilled without failure.

"THE LAW OF THE LORD."

"The law," "the law of the Lord," and "the law of Moses" are precisely the same. See Luke 2:22-27; 1 Chron. 22:12,13; 2 Chron. 31:3,4; Neh. 9:3; Psa. 1:2; 19:7; 2 Chron. 17:9. The decalogue alone is never called "the law of the Lord," not once. Seventh-day Adventists constantly and invariably apply the term, "the law of the Lord" to the decalogue alone, when the inspired writers never once used it so.

"THE LAW OF GOD."

"The law," "the law of God," "the law of Moses" and "the book of the law" are all the same, which shows that "the law of God" can not be limited to the decalogue. See Neh. 7:1,2,7,8,9,13,18; 10:28,29,34,36; Josh. 24:26; Ezra 7:6,10,12. The

decalogue is a part of "the law of God," but alone it is never once called by that term.

"THE LAW OF MOSES."

Sabbatarians claim that "the law of Moses" means only the ceremonial law, and does not include the decalogue, nor the moral law. Thus Elder G. I. Butler, in his book on Galatians, p. 33, says: "Hitherto we have not had a single reference to the moral law, but through it all constant reference is made to the other law, the law of Moses." This claim is wholly unfounded. See John 7:19, murder; Heb. 10:28 with Deut. 17:2-6, idolatry; John 8:5 with Lev. 20:10, adultery; Matt. 7:10 with Ex. 20:12, fifth commandment.

The "book of the law," which was put into the side of the ark, is claimed by Sabbatarians as "the ceremonial law." If this claim fails them, then their whole "two law" theory goes down. But that "book of the law embraced at least all the book of Deuteronomy. See chap. 1:5 on to chap. 31: 9,24-26. See Gal. 3:10, where Deut. 27:26 is quoted as "the book of the law." Compare Deut. 28:61; 29:21; 30:10; 31:26; Josh. 1:8; 8:31; 2 Kings 14:6; Deut. 24:16; Neh. 8:3. The book of the law in the side of the ark then, embraced all of Deuteronomy at least. But that contains a copy of the decalogue (chap. 5); love to God (chap. 6:5), and every moral duty (as chap 24:17; 27:15-26, etc.). There was as much moral law in that book in the side of the ark as there was on the tables of stone in the ark! Even Elder Butler is compelled to admit this: "The 'book of the law' which was placed 'in the side of the ark,' or at the side of it, contained both the

moral and ceremonial laws."—"Book on Galatians," p. 39. This drops the very bottom out of the two law theory. Their ceremonial law after all contains the moral law, too!